Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/883,109	GASCOYNE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kishor Mayekar	1753	

All Participants:

(1) *Kishor Mayekar*.

(2) *Michael Barrett*.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: *21 January 2004*

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
N/A

Claims discussed:
1-27

Prior art documents discussed:
N/A

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Called the Attorney a week ago to clarify to the contradiction between the recited step of pressurizing and the disclosure in lines 7-8 of page 13 of the specification to the forming of a fluid packet after the hold-off pressure is reached. The Attorney replied today that the step of pressurizing had been claimed incorrectly and expected the 112 rejection on the matter.